



The Attitudes and Beliefs of Deception in the Coach-Player Relationship

Kelsey Blauser Angelo State University

Thesis Chair: Drew A. Curtis

Thesis Committee: Jordan B. Daniel, Bill A. Davidson, Carlos A. Flores

INTRODUCTION

Depaulo and Kashy (1998) discuss how children and adults alike commit every-day lies. These lies are acceptable to us because they cause little harm to those around us. Bandura’s social learning theory explains how we learn how to lie. People learn from observing, imitating, and modeling (2016). Children observe adults lie, imitate the lie, and then model it for themselves, but unlike adults, children may not be able to decipher what lies are acceptable and what lies are not. Much like children struggle with differentiating lies, athletes could as well. Athletes are taught techniques to manipulate or “deceive” the other team. Faking, misdirecting, screening and juking are all techniques done in sport to gain an advantage over an opponent. Athletes may struggle to differentiate what is acceptable sport behavior, and what is honest in life outside of their sport.

METHODS

There were 116 participants recruited for the study. Using a counterbalanced design, participants were randomly assigned to two orders of the questionnaires. The questionnaires included were; demographics, the Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS), the Athlete’s Attitude Toward Coach’s Deception Measure (AATCDM), and Perception of Performance Questions. Both groups completed the same questionnaires, the only difference was if they took the LSS-Regular followed by the LSS-Liar or the LSS-Liar followed by the LSS-Regular. The LSS-Liar contains the same questions as the LSS-Regular except the LSS-Liar has the phrase “I think my coach is lying when he/she...”.

	t	df	M	Attitude Change	Attitude
Liking the coach*	-8.198	89	2.60	Decrease	Negative
Being angry at the* coach?	5.609	88	5.04	Increase	Negative
Seeing the coach as a* bad coach?	4.875	89	4.77	Increase	Negative
Thinking negatively* about the coach?	5.534	89	4.92	Increase	Negative
Judging the coach harshly?	2.505	89	4.41	No change	No change
Desire to interact with the coach? *	-10.138	89	2.57	Decrease	Negative
Enthusiasm to interact with the coach? *	-9.851	89	2.56	Decrease	Negative
Judging the coach as a good coach? *	-7.316	89	2.99	Decrease	Negative
Speaking poorly of the coach with others?	.601	89	4.09	No change	No change
Trusting the coach? *	-10.469	89	2.34	Decrease	Negative
Thinking positively about the coach? *	-9.041	88	2.65	Decrease	Negative
Viewing the coach as sincere? *	-9.599	86	2.45	Decrease	Negative
Successful *	-5.667	89	2.99	Decrease	Negative
Pathological	-1.763	88	3.67	No change	No change
Weak *	5.454	89	4.86	Increase	Negative
Compliant *	-6.299	87	3.05	Decrease	Negative
Pleasant *	-8.016	88	2.72	Decrease	Negative
Lazy *	4.686	89	4.79	Increase	Negative
Awkward	1.593	89	4.24	No change	No change
Knowledgeable *	-3.974	87	3.36	Decrease	Negative
Intelligent	-2.874	89	3.57	No change	No change
Likeable*	-9.436	89	2.58	Decrease	Negative
Adjusted*	-6.984	88	3.01	Decrease	Negative

RESULTS

An independent *t*-test was performed to compare the scores between the two orders of the LSS. Results indicated that there was no statistical difference between the order presentation or the LSS-Liar and LSS-Regular. Further there was no statistically significant difference between the order presentation regarding the AATCDM. A MANOVA was completed to compare the dimensions of the LSS (ie, training, democratic, autocratic, social and positive). A one sample *t*-test was performed on the AATCDM to determine if they differed significantly from a no change anchor (Bonferroni = .002). The t-test showed that 18 out of 23 of the attitudes were statistically significant and all attitudes were negative. A one sample t-test was performed on the Perception of Performance Questions to determine if they differed significantly from a change anchor (Bonferroni = .017). Each of the Perception of Performance Questions were a statistically significantly different. Each question revealed that when participants are being deceived and think about being deceived they perceive their performance as decreased. Also participants revealed that coach deception does affect the perception of performance for athletes.

CONCLUSIONS

The study showed that participants scored their coaches lower on the LSS when they were presented with the priming phrase. Participants view their coaches negatively if they think they are being lied to. This study also found that when participants think a coach is lying to them, they perceive their performance as decreased. The current study provides an open door for sport psychology to look at deception and for deception research to look at the different relationships within sport.

